

ON PRIMITIVE DIRICHLET CHARACTERS AND THE RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS

WILLIAM D. BANKS

Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
bbanks@math.missouri.edu

AHMET M. GÜLOĞLU

Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
ahmet@math.missouri.edu

C. WESLEY NEVANS

Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
nevans@math.missouri.edu

Abstract

For any natural number n , let $\mathcal{X}'_n$ be the set of primitive Dirichlet characters modulo n . We show that if the Riemann hypothesis is true, then the inequality $|\mathcal{X}'_{2n_k}| \leq C_2 e^{-\gamma} \varphi(2n_k) / \log \log(2n_k)$ holds for all $k \geq 1$, where n_k is the product of the first k primes, γ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant, C_2 is the twin prime constant, and $\varphi(n)$ is the Euler function. On the other hand, if the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there are infinitely many k for which the same inequality holds and infinitely many k for which it fails to hold.

1 Introduction

For any natural number n , let $\mathcal{X}_n$ be the set of Dirichlet characters modulo n , and let $\mathcal{X}'_n$ be the subset of *primitive* characters in $\mathcal{X}_n$.

The purpose of the present note is to establish a connection between the *classical* Riemann hypothesis and the collection of sets $\{\mathcal{X}'_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Our work is motivated by and relies on the 1983 paper of J.-L. Nicolas [2] in which a relation is established between the Riemann hypothesis and certain values of the Euler function $\varphi(n)$; see also [3].

Theorem 1. *For every $k \geq 1$, let n_k be the product of the first k primes. Let γ be the Euler-Mascheroni constant and C_2 the twin prime constant.*

(i) *If the Riemann hypothesis is true, then the inequality*

$$|\mathcal{X}'_{2n_k}| \leq C_2 e^{-\gamma} \frac{\varphi(2n_k)}{\log \log(2n_k)} \quad (1)$$

holds for all $k \geq 1$.

(ii) *If the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there are infinitely many k for which (1) holds and infinitely many k for which it fails to hold.*

We recall that

$$\gamma = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{m=1}^n \frac{1}{m} - \log n \right) = 0.5772156649 \dots,$$

and

$$C_2 = \prod_{p>2} \frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} = 0.6601618158 \dots.$$

To prove the theorem, we study the ratios

$$\rho(n) = \frac{|\mathcal{X}'_n|}{|\mathcal{X}_n|} \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Note that $\rho(n)$ is the *proportion* of Dirichlet characters modulo n that are primitive characters. Since $\rho(n) \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\rho(p) = 1 - 1/(p-1)$ for every prime p , it is clear that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \rho(n) = 1.$$

As for the minimal order, we shall prove the following:

$$\liminf_{\substack{n \rightarrow \infty \\ n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{4}}} \rho(n) \log \log n = C_2 e^{-\gamma}. \quad (2)$$

Note that natural numbers $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ are excluded since $\rho(n) = 0$ for those numbers; see (6) below.

In Section 2 we show that the inequalities

$$\rho(2n_k) \log \log(2n_k) \leq \rho(n) \log \log n \quad (n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{4}, \omega(n) = k) \quad (3)$$

hold for every fixed $k > 1$, where $\omega(n)$ is the number of distinct prime divisors of n , and we also show that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \rho(2n_k) \log \log(2n_k) = C_2 e^{-\gamma}. \quad (4)$$

Clearly, (2) is an immediate consequence of (3) and (4).

Since $|\mathcal{X}_n| = \varphi(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality (1) is clearly equivalent to

$$\rho(2n_k) \log \log(2n_k) \leq C_2 e^{-\gamma}. \quad (5)$$

In Section 3 we study this inequality using techniques and results from [2], and these investigations lead to the statement of Theorem 1.

Acknowledgement. The authors wish to thank Pieter Moree for his careful reading of the manuscript and for several useful comments.

2 Small values of $\rho(n)$

The cardinality of $\mathcal{X}_n$ is $\varphi(n)$, and that of $\mathcal{X}'_n$ is

$$|\mathcal{X}'_n| = n \prod_{p \parallel n} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \prod_{p^2 \mid n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^2$$

(see, for example, [1, § 9.1]); hence, it follows that

$$\rho(n) = \frac{\varphi(n)}{n} \prod_{p \parallel n} \frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}). \quad (6)$$

Turning to the proof of (3), let $k > 1$ be fixed, and denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the set of integers $n \not\equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ with $\omega(n) = k$. Let $p_1, p_2, \dots$ be the sequence of consecutive prime numbers. For each integer $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, let $\mathcal{S}_j$ be the set of numbers $n \in \mathcal{S}$ that have precisely j distinct prime divisors larger than p_k . Since $\mathcal{S}$ is the union of the sets $\{\mathcal{S}_j\}$, to prove (3) it suffices to show that the inequalities

$$\rho(2n_k) \log \log(2n_k) \leq \rho(n) \log \log n \quad (n \in \mathcal{S}_j) \quad (7)$$

hold for every fixed $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$.

For any $n \in \mathcal{S}_0$ we can write $n = 2p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ with each $\alpha_j \geq 1$. Using (6) and the fact that $2n_k = 2p_1 \cdots p_k$ we have

$$\rho(2n_k) = \rho(n) \prod_{\substack{j=2 \\ (\alpha_j \geq 2)}}^k \frac{p_j(p_j - 2)}{(p_j - 1)^2} \leq \rho(n).$$

Since $2n_k \leq n$ we also have $\log \log(2n_k) \leq \log \log n$, and (7) follows for $j = 0$.

Proceeding by induction, let us suppose that (7) has been established for some $j \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$. If n' is an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{S}_{j+1}$, then $q \mid n'$ for some prime $q > p_k$; note that $q \geq 5$ since $k > 1$. Writing $n' = q^\alpha m$ with $q \nmid m$, we have $\omega(m) = k-1$, hence for at least one index $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ the prime p_i does not divide m . Put $n = p_i^\beta m$, where $\beta = 2$ if $p_i = 2$ and $\beta = 1$ otherwise. Clearly, $n \in \mathcal{S}_j$. Also, $n \leq n'$ since $q > \max\{p_i, 2^2\}$, and thus $\log \log n \leq \log \log n'$. Finally, using (6) we see that

$$\frac{\rho(n')}{\rho(m)} = \begin{cases} 1 - 1/(q-1) & \text{if } \alpha = 1, \\ 1 - 1/q & \text{if } \alpha \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\frac{\rho(n)}{\rho(m)} = \begin{cases} 1 - 1/(p_i - 1) & \text{if } \beta = 1, \\ 1/2 & \text{if } \beta = 2. \end{cases}$$

As $q > p_i$, we have $\rho(n) \leq \rho(n')$ in all cases. Putting everything together, we see that

$$\rho(2n_k) \log \log(2n_k) \leq \rho(n) \log \log n \leq \rho(n') \log \log n'.$$

Since $n' \in \mathcal{S}_{j+1}$ is arbitrary, we obtain (7) with j replaced by $j+1$, which completes the induction and finishes our proof of (3).

Next, we turn to the proof of (4). Using the Prime Number Theorem in the form

$$\log n_k = \sum_{p \leq p_k} \log p = (1 + o(1))p_k \quad (k \rightarrow \infty)$$

together with Mertens' theorem (see [1, Theorem 2.7(e)]), it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \log \log(2n_k) \prod_{p \leq p_k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \right\} = e^{-\gamma}. \quad (8)$$

Also,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{2 < p \leq p_k} \frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C_2 \prod_{p > p_k} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p-2)}\right) = C_2. \quad (9)$$

By (6) we have

$$\rho(2n_k) = \prod_{p \leq p_k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \prod_{2 < p \leq p_k} \frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} \quad (k \geq 1),$$

and thus (4) is an immediate consequence of (8) and (9).

3 Proof of Theorem 1

As in [2, Théorème 3] we put

$$f(x) = e^\gamma \log \vartheta(x) \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \quad (x \geq 2),$$

where $\vartheta(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \log p$ is the Chebyshev ϑ -function. For our purposes, it is convenient to define

$$g(x) = e^\gamma \log(\vartheta(x) + \log 2) \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \prod_{p > x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p(p-2)}\right) \quad (x \geq 2),$$

This definition is motivated by the fact that

$$g(p_k) = C_2^{-1} e^\gamma \rho(2n_k) \log \log(2n_k) \quad (k \geq 1).$$

As mentioned earlier, the inequalities (1) and (5) are equivalent, and (5) is clearly equivalent to

$$\log g(p_k) \leq 0.$$

Thus, to prove Theorem 1 it suffices to study the sign of $\log g(x)$.

By the trivial inequality $\log(1+t) \leq t$ for all $t > -1$ and the fact that $g(x) > f(x)$ for all $x \geq 2$, it is easy to see that

$$0 < \log \frac{g(x)}{f(x)} \leq \frac{\log 2}{\vartheta(x) \log \vartheta(x)} + \frac{1}{x-2} \quad (x > 2). \quad (10)$$

Here, we have used the fact that

$$\sum_{p>x} \frac{1}{p(p-2)} \leq \sum_{n \geq [x]+1} \frac{1}{n(n-2)} = \frac{2[x]-1}{2[x]([x]-1)} < \frac{1}{x-2} \quad (x > 2).$$

First, let us suppose that the Riemann hypothesis is true. In this case, we have from [2, p. 383]:

$$\log f(x) \leq -\frac{0.8}{\sqrt{x} \log x} \quad (x \geq 3000).$$

Using this bound in (10) together with the inequality $\vartheta(x) \geq 4x/5$ (which holds unconditionally for $x \geq 121$ by [4, Theorems 4 and 18]), one sees that

$$\log g(x) \leq \frac{\log 2}{(4x/5) \log(4x/5)} + \frac{1}{x-2} - \frac{0.8}{\sqrt{x} \log x} \leq -\frac{0.6}{\sqrt{x} \log x}$$

for all $x \geq 3000$. This implies the desired bound (5) for all $k \geq 431$; for smaller values of k , the bound (5) may be verified by a direct computation. This proves Theorem 1 under the Riemann hypothesis.

Next, suppose that the Riemann hypothesis is false, and let θ denote the supremum of the real parts of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function. Then, by [2, Théorème 3c] one has

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^b \log f(x) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^b \log f(x) < 0$$

for any fixed number b such that $1 - \theta < b < 1/2$. In view of (10) and the Chebyshev bound $\vartheta(x) \gg x$ it is clear that

$$\log g(x) = \log f(x) + O(x^{-1});$$

hence, we also have

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^b \log g(x) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} x^b \log g(x) < 0.$$

In particular, $\log g(p_k)$ changes sign infinitely often, which implies Theorem 1 if the Riemann hypothesis is false.

References

- [1] H. L. Montgomery and R. C. Vaughan, *Multiplicative number theory. I. Classical theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **97**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [2] J. L. Nicolas, ‘Petites valeurs de la fonction d’Euler,’ *J. Number Theory* **17** (1983), no. 3, 375–388.
- [3] G. Robin, ‘Grandes valeurs de la fonction somme des diviseurs et hypothèse de Riemann,’ *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **63** (1984), no. 2, 187–213.
- [4] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, ‘Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers,’ *Illinois J. Math.* **6** (1962), 64–94.